



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

*Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, begründet von Julius Zacher, herausgegeben von Hugo Gering und Friedrich Kauffmann. Band XXIX.

Pp. 1-49. FRIEDRICH KAUFFMANN, *Metrische Studien*. 1. *Zur Reimtechnik des Alliterationsverses*, pp. 1-17, is largely directed against R. M. Meyer's *Alliterierende doppelkonsonanz im Heliand* (*Ztschr.* 26, 149 ff.). Meyer sets aside Snorri's rule, that the hauptstab governs the alliteration, by affirming that alliteration is probably progressive rather than regressive. He is charged with vague conceptions of the second staff and with contradictions. His wrong conclusions are attributed to the fact that he gives up the long line as technical unit. K.'s examination of the C-verses in the *Heliand* makes it very improbable that syllabic rhyme was the result of conscious effort on the part of the poet. His observations in regard to the occurrence of double alliteration in the first half-verse show that it is the favorite form at the conclusion of a direct discourse, whether monologue or dialogue, and also especially before a strong pause in the cæsura, which fact might throw some light on the punctuation of those times as compared with that of our own. The pause in the cæsura was in all likelihood longer than that at the end of the verse, although the rhyme is not complete until we come to it. Numerous proof passages are given, also a list of "was als reimspiel gelten könnte," as far as the long line is concerned, collected from *Hildebrandslied*, *Muspilli*, *Wessobrunner Gebet*, *Merseburger Zaubersprüche*, *Genesis*, and *Heliand*.

Meyer's hypothesis is further objected to on the ground that it would require the acceptance of a development of svarabhakti vls., unprecedented and not exemplified by traditional proof passages. Of interest is also footnote 2, p. 3, in regard to the first occurrence and use of the term *alliteration*.

2. *Dreihebige verse in Otfrid's Evangelienbuch*. The manner in which O.'s verses were recited is to be decided on the basis of the neumes found in the Mss. They were those used in the Latin church; and Fleischer (*Abhandlungen über mittelalterliche gesangsschriften, teil I.: über ursprung und entzifferung der Neumen*, Leipzig, 1895) has found the key to their interpretation in the *accentus ecclesiasticus*. O.'s object must have been to have his *lib. evang.* recited in the way in which it was customary to read the gospels and epistles from the New Testament. To this points also his

expression *hujus cantus lectio* (*ad Liuth.* 10), and the term *lectiones* (*Theodisce conscriptae*), which he repeatedly applies to his work. The only thing similar in character to the *accentus eccles.* is the recitation of the nursery rhyme, which shows the same melodic development of the cadences. In the rhyme poetry introduced by O. the rhythmic structure is musical (in the alliterative verse, oratorical, against Heusler, *Über altg. versbau*, p. 100 ff.), as proven by O.'s own testimony and by the passages for which the neumes exist. O. has taken from contemporary Latin rhyme practice the masculine and feminine rhyme. These essentially different forms of rhyme call for essentially different forms of verse. The verses with feminine rhyme are always complete (*voll*); those with masculine rhyme have either four or three arses (*stumpf*). The half-verses with masculine rhyme and having only one ictus are "stumpf." An examination of the complete material (the accentuator of P frequently differing from the one of V, and by his practice substantiating K.'s position) leads to the formulation of certain general fundamental rules, in practice not always strictly adhered to, for the verse accentuation in O.'s *Evangelienbuch*: 1. Accents are found only on full measures, and may stand initially or finally. 2. Full verses have one or two accents, verses with three arses (*stumpfe*) have one. 3. Of the two full measures, the one that concludes the verse may remain without accent if the two most heavily stressed syllables of the verse follow immediately upon each other. 4. Incomplete (*stumpfe*) measures remain without accent, measures bearing an accent are always full. 5. The rhythmical secondary icti are undesignated (frequent exceptions). 6. The accents fall upon the heavily stressed parts of the measure. 7. Full verses frequently have only one accent. This always lies upon the heavily stressed part of the first measure. 8. Incomplete verses have the accent on the heavily stressed part of the first measure if the verse concludes with the incomplete measure; otherwise, 9, upon the heavily stressed part of the second measure if the verse commences with the incomplete measure.

This view of the rhythmical structure of O.'s verse is substantiated by proof material from other monuments. His verse of three arses is an integral part of his reform, and has continued valid as long as his long line continued to be used. A classical proof for this is the Nibelungen-strophe. K.'s results are valuable as furnishing a fixed historical starting-point for investigations dealing with this verse and

its descendants as appearing in later times. To be noted here and to be compared with K.'s results should be the contributions to the same subject by Fr. Saran, *Über vortragsweise und zweck des Evangelienbuchs Otfrids von Weissenburg*: Halle, 1896; *Zur metrik Otfrids von Weissenburg*, pp. 179-204 of the *Phil. studien, festgabe für E. Sievers*: Halle, 1896.

Pp. 49-63. HUGO GERING emends seventeen passages from the *Lieder-Edda*.

Pp. 63-73, 510-531. E. ARENS contributes *Studien zum Tatian*. Part I. is a clear presentation of the mistakes in Tatian. They are divided into three categories: 1. Those due to misreading. 2. Those due to carelessness, by far the greatest number, comprising mistakes in the use of case, number, gender, pronouns, tense, mode, conjunctions. Contamination of two forms also occurs; e.g. *her thō arstantenti inti nam*, 9, 3, from *arstantenti nam* and *arstuont inti nam*. 3. Those due to an insufficient knowledge of Latin. In Part II., *Mehrere übersetzer*, Arens refutes the Sievers-Steinmeyer hypothesis of ten, resp. twenty-four translators. Their criteria are not important enough. *Quedenti* and *sus quedenti* (= *dicens*) appear side by side in passages undoubtedly the work of one person. The same can be said of *antlingan* and *antuurten*. For the fact that in certain passages only the one or the other appears, A. adopts the explanation of W. Walther (*Die deutsche bibelübersetzung des mittelalters*: Braunsch., 1892, sp. 446). The translator had for the time being accustomed himself to the one form. At other times, again, he preferred a different rendering. In regard to the use of conjunctions, also one of S.-St.'s criteria, it can be said that they are frequently left untranslated throughout all the sections. A regularity in translating, strictly and uniformly adhered to, can nowhere be found; and as this is a presupposition to the theory of Steinmeyer and Sievers, their arguments fail to convince. According to A., the translation was made in sections, the parts that resemble interlinear translation most being made first (so the Prologus and perhaps 1, 1-4). The long section, 77-82, was undoubtedly translated without any connection with any other part, whether as the very first piece, or whether it was inserted later. The theory of *one* translator is favored also by the fact that in many passages the choice or form of the German words is clearly attributable to a definite purpose. Further, a fondness for alliterative expressions is evinced, found partly in standing formulas, partly they are obtained by adding some word for which

the Latin has no equivalent; and again an alliterating word is used instead of one otherwise more common in Tatian.

Pp. 73-86. B. SINGER, *Die quellen von Heinrichs von Freiberg Tristan*, endeavors to show that H. not only used Ulrich von Türheim and Gottfried, but also Eilhart von Oberg, as against F. Wiegandt (*Heinrich von Freiberg in seinem verhältnis zu Eilhart und Ulrich*: Rostock, 1879) and a French Tristan romance, perhaps the lost one of Chrestien de Troies.

Pp. 87-98. PRIEBSCH, *Der Krieg zwischen dem Lyb und der Seel*, gives the full text of this incomplete little poem (188 ll.), which he discovered some time ago in the British Museum in a Ms. written by Ludwig Sterner, and originally bound together with a printed copy of Gengenbach's *Der welsch Flusz*. The author is Hentz von den Eychen (l. 183), a Swiss poet. Vocabulary and rhyme argue for a Swiss home. Its correct metrical structure and fluency of language assign it to a period not far remote from the blütezeit of MHG. poetry.

Pp. 98-109. H. DÜNTZER, *Goethe's Jenaer sonette vom december 1807*, proves untenable Kuno Fischer's assertion (*Goethe's sonettenkranz*: Heidelberg, 1896) that these sonnets were all inspired by Minna Herzlieb, and that they form *one* wreath twined for her. There are too many internal and external contradictions. Cf., also against Fischer, J. Schipper, *Über Goethe's sonette*, Pub. Mod. Lang. Ass., New Series, IV. 275 ff., where five or six of these sonnets are shown to have been inspired by Bettina.

Pp. 145-149. J. H. GALLÉE, *Zur altsächsischen grammatik*, takes exception to a statement by R. Kögel (*Ergänzungsheft*, p. 19) that the participles *githungin*, *bismitin*, *gefallin* of the OS. Genesis are Frisonisms. He defends them as genuine OS. forms, declaring that, at some time, double forms in *-an* and *-in* were in existence in OS. as well as in OE. Similarly he argues for *hu* as an OS. form. *Hû* and *huuð* existed side by side; traces of both forms can still be found in the Saxon provinces of Holland.

Pp. 150-164. G. ROSENHAGEN, *Muntane Cluse* (*Parz.* 382, 24), elaborates a suggestion thrown out by him, in a note to v. 508 of the Stricker's *Daniel*, that there once existed a now lost German Lancelot-poem, to a knowledge of which must be traced Wolfram's allusion to Lancelot in the *Parz.*, and not to a direct influence of Chrestien's *Conte de la charette* or of the French prose novel. The article also furnishes additional evidence that direct acquaintance with French

epics was rare at that time in Germany, and that they were circulated by oral transmission.

Pp. 165-170. FEDOR BECH makes suggestions and corrections to the text of Edward Schroeder's *Zwei altddeutsche rittermären*, and also retracts his view, expressed *Ger.* 17, 177, of the relation of the Craon poet to Hartmann; rejects, however, as insufficient Schroeder's arguments to prove that the poet drew from Gottfried's *Tristan*.

Pp. 171, 172. JOHANNES STOSCH prints from *Kl. I. Deutsche historienbibeln des mittelalters*, p. 520, a prose version of the *Tobiassegen*, not noted by Steinmeyer in the new edition of MSD.

Pp. 172-177. ALEXANDER TILLE describes the fragment of a Ms. of the *Younger Titurel* lately found at Xanten and containing twenty-seven strophes entire or in part. The complete text is given.

Pp. 177-179. A. JEITTELES, *Aar und Adler*, gives several citations to prove the existence of the short form *ar*, *aru* in the time from 1450-1600, as against Kluge (*Ztschr.* XXIV. 311 ff.), who can discover no trace of it in poets of the 16/17. century.

Pp. 180-195. J. W. BRUINIER, *Untersuchungen zur entwicklungsgeschichte des volksschauspiels vom Dr. Faust. I. Der grosse monolog*. The author seeks to reconstruct the skeleton of the old monologue. An examination of the Latin phrases interspersed in the text of A D L M<sup>1</sup> M<sup>2</sup> U W and of the use made in the different versions of the sentiments contained in them, leads to the following conclusions: 1. The oldest monologue lacks the *facultätenschau*, the polyhistory of Faust, the motive of the unsatisfied thirst for knowledge. Its fundamental idea was Faust's dissatisfaction with his position; necromancy is to help him to something higher. This archetype is nowhere retained pure. 2. Very early the recast represented by A U must have been made; it could not maintain itself. 3. D J Kr z (and Goethe's basis?) go back to a type that had incorporated Marlowe's *facultätenschau*. 4. (Schroeder and?) the version containing the aria *Fauste jene himmelsgaben* have both the *facultätenschau* and the polyhistory of Faust, thereby approaching Marlowe still more closely. Between the oldest monologue and that of Marlowe there are several important coincidences and divergences. As to the relation of the two to each other, Br. proposes three possibilities: 1. The German popular play composed an entirely new monologue which had nothing in common with that of Marlowe. 2. Both it and Marlowe go back to the same dramatic source. 3. The German play is the source of Marlowe's play.

Pp. 195-217. REINHOLD STEIG continues his contributions, *Zu den kleineren schriften der brüder Grimm*. The *ankündigung der altdänischen heldenlieder* (*KL. Schr.* 1, 172) is shown to belong only to a small extent to Wilhelm Grimm; it is largely the work of Arnim. The anonymous review of Henriette Schubart's translation of Scottish songs and ballads (*Lpz. Litztg.*, 1818) was not written by Wilhelm, but by Jacob Grimm; on the other hand, the anonymous review of Ernst Wagner's *Historisches A B C eines vierzigjährigen Hennebergischen fiebelschützen* (*Heidelb. Jahrb.* 5, 2, 371-374) must be credited to Wilhelm Grimm.

Pp. 289-305. H. HIRT, *Die stellung des germanischen im kreise der verwandten sprachen*. An attempt to prove the untenableness of the old hypothesis that in prehistoric times there existed an intimate relation between the Germanic and Letto-Slavonic groups. The few correlations found are according to Hirt either explainable as remnants of original language-material (the *-m* forms, Goth. *wulfam*, O. Slav. *vlŭkomŭ*, Lith. *vilkamo*), or lose their convincing power because found only in Ger. and Slav. (the change from *sr* to *str*), or only in Ger. and Lith. (Goth. *ainlif*, *tvalif*: Lith. *vėnólīka*, *dvyĺīka*). On the other hand, the divergencies are great throughout, in phonological, morphological, and lexical respects, not to speak of the general impression of great dissimilarity which the two languages make. Joh. Schmidt's lists of words corresponding in these two groups are found to be very unreliable; important corrections are made to the lists given by Kluge, *Grd.* I. 320, and by Kretschmer, *Einl. in die gesch. der griech. sprache*, 109 a, in support of the old view. As a more convincing proof of his position Hirt regards the fact that by far greater correspondences are found between the Germanic and Italic groups. Extensive word-lists are given to substantiate his assertion. These are classified in the following categories: *a.* time and law (11); *b.* qualities (13); *c.* verbs (30); *d.* animal and vegetable kingdoms (19); *e.* parts of the body, etc. (8); unclassified thirty words. Frequently these words are absolutely identical, but the supposition that they were borrowed is excluded because of the operation of phonetic laws. This coincidence extends farther to the use of certain suffixes, *e.g.*, *-uo* in adj. denoting color; *-no* in distributives; *-nē* to denote direction 'whence'; *-tero* as comparative suffix. Likewise there is a similarity in the formation of the pf.: *a.* types with long *vl*, *e.g.* Lat. *ēdimus*, Goth. *ētum*; Lat. *vēnimus*, Goth. *qēmum*; *b.* types without reduplication, *e.g.* Lat.

*liquit*, Goth. *laihv*; Lat. *fūdit*, Goth. *gaut*; *c.* types with reduplication, *e.g.* Lat. *tundo, tutudi*, Goth. *stautan, staistaut*; *d.* the pres. of *ip*-verbs (as already noted by Bernecker and Giles), *e.g.* Lat. *capio, capis, capit*, OHG. *heffu, hevis, hevit*. Hirt clearly shows the insufficiency of the support to be found for the old hypothesis and indirectly argues against Schmidt's wave-theory, although he does not definitely disprove it, since it might be applied to account for the coincidences in the Germanic and Italic groups.

Pp. 306-337. FRIEDRICH KAUFFMANN, *Beiträge zur quellenkritik der gotischen bibelübersetzung*. The prefatory remarks give a succinct account of the former and present views held in regard to the recensions of the Greek New Testament in general and the sources of the Gothic Bible in particular. To represent one side of the latter question as it stands now, K. quotes from Gregory's *Prolegomena*, p. 202: 'usus est Ulfilas textu Graeco, maxima ex parte Antiocheno, cum multis lectionibus Occidentalibus, nonnullis antiquis non-occidentalibus'; these western admixtures are not emendations according to an Italic version, but probably due to the fact 'quod et Ulfilas et emendatores illi codicibus Graecis textui Italico similibus usi sint.' The other side is represented by Sievers (*Grd.* II. 69 f.), who rejects the theory of an original connection of the Greek text used by Wulfila with the Itala, also that of later interpolations by Italian critics, in favor of Marold's view that in the parts showing Occidentalisms there was an intentional preference on the part of the translator for the Itala. K. re-examines the whole question in the light of the results furnished by modern biblical criticism and treats 1. the Old Testament fragments. Lagarde proves in his *Librorum Veteris Testamenti canonicorum pars prior*, Gött. 1883, p. xiv, that Wulfila used the Greek Lucian, mentioned by Hieronymus in his letter to the Goths Sunja and Friþila, for his translation of the Old Testament. A comparison of Lagarde's text with the Gothic, while it shows almost literal identity in Neh. v-vii. surprises by a striking difference between Ezra ii. and the Gothic fragment called Ezra ii. Instead of tacitly accepting the traditional view, K. tests the statement of Castiglione (*Spec.* p. xvii) and proves conclusively that the latter passage is not a part of Ezra ii., but of Neh. vii. His proof is based upon the distribution of *νιοί* and *ἄνδρες* and their Gothic equivalents, in the three portions containing the passage in question, viz., Ezra ii., Neh. vii., and 3. Ezra v. The Gothic text agrees only with Neh.; *e.g.* Ezra ii., *νιοι της Παμα*; Neh. vii., *ανδρες*



Papa; 3. Ezra v., *νοι της Papa*: Goth. *wairos Rama*; Ezra ii., *νοι Ναβου*; Neh. vii., *ανδρες Ναβου*; 3. Ezra v., *νοι Ναβου*: Goth. *wairos Nabawis*, etc. The Septuagint does not offer anything to weaken this argumentation and the result is, therefore, twofold. The fragment is assigned its proper place, and Lagarde's view that Wulfila used the Lucian is confirmed. Additional proof is furnished by the fact that Goth. *Assaum* has its equivalent only in Lagarde's *Ασσουμ* (Neh. vii. 24). Likewise *Eeiramis* = *Ηιραμ*, *Aidduins* = *Εδδουα*, *Jareimis* = *Ιαπειμ*. On the other hand, that this text of Lucian was not the original but a derived text is shown by the fact that for Goth. *Babaawis*, Lag. has *Βοκχει*; for *Addinis*, *Αδδου* or *Εδδου*; for *Ateiris*, *Αζηρ* or *Αζερ*, etc.; while with the aid of parallel passages the Septuagint here shows forms identical with the Gothic. Similarly the correct forms of the numerals following the names can be ascertained. The whole second half of the well-known passage from the Vienna Ms. K. assigns to Gen. v., and contends against W. Grimm that these meagre fragments also go back to Lucian. Then follows the text of all the Old Testament fragments, both Gothic and Greek, with an apparatus of the most important Greek and Latin variants, the whole forming a valuable correction to the text as constructed by Bernhardt. K.'s answer to the question as to the sources of the Gothic translation is, in brief: The translator probably had a mixed text; that of Lucian was the *foundation*, but not the direct *source*, of his work, variants from the Greek Vulgate and, perhaps, from a third recension (the Hesychian?) had entered into it.

These contributions, so pithy and suggestive throughout, are to be continued in Vol. XXX.

Pp. 338-345. FEDOR BECH writes *Zur Kritik und Erklärung des von H. Paul herausgegebenen Gedichtes: Tristan als Mönch*.

Pp. 345-372. J. W. BRUNIER continues his *Untersuchungen zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des Volksschauspiels vom Dr. Faust* (cf. pp. 180-195). II. *Die erste geisterstimmenscene*. Such a scene is found in all versions except in G Mü O. It forms one of the oldest parts of the drama, and had its position originally immediately after the monologue. Its earliest form is reconstructed (p. 346). To the parts contained in it were added, later, new motives which, proceeding from an archetype, influenced also other versions. Marlowe, too, has spirits' voices in the same place; but since they remain entirely without effect upon Faust, it may be concluded that these verses (90-105 A) were a later interpolation. Again the question is:

Which of the two had the scene first? III. *Die studenten mit den zauberbüchern*. Likewise one of the oldest parts and found in all recensions which do not connect the conjuration scene directly with the monologue. Except in U, it follows upon the spirits' scene, or, where this has changed position or has disappeared, upon the monologue. Br. finds it safe to assume for the archetype: 1. That Faust did not have the books necessary for the conjuration before the arrival of the students. 2. That these do not appear accidentally, but that there is a previous understanding between them and Faust, their object in coming, as is evident from the different versions, being to bring Faust the desired books. 3. That they are genuine students, not devils, nor magicians, and therefore not identical with Marlowe's magicians. The arguments advanced to establish such an identity he regards as extremely superficial. The German archetype agrees closely with the pre-Marlowean legend (cf. *Kloster*, 2, 293); and he joins Schade in believing that the students mentioned by Widman are those of the puppet-play. The reminders of Marlowe which later entered into the original form of the German drama under the influence of the English play so often given in Germany during the seventeenth century are not essential. The reconstructed scene, as it was in the archetype, introduces the students on the stage, and shows it to be Faust's intention personally to entertain them, a feature which Marlowe undoubtedly borrowed from the German play. In the versions that leave the students behind the scenes, Wagner comes more into prominence, and has to fulfil functions formerly pertaining to Faust or the students. It naturally falls thus to him to invite the latter to the collation. This collation Br. connects with the Casper scene, declaring that originally the indications of it—empty glasses and plates—are still on the table as Casper enters, and that these awaken in him the delusion that he is in a tavern. Br. is able to establish three (or four) principal old versions, under which the various texts can be grouped; but since it is impossible to ascertain all the details which the scene may have contained, he does not give a genealogical table of them.

Pp. 433-509. O. HERTEL, *Die sprache Luthers im sermon von den guten werken* (1520) *nach der handschriftlichen überlieferung*. The object of the author is, by an exhaustive examination of one monument belonging to the early period of the reformer's literary activity, to help throw light upon the development of his language. The introductory remarks voice the sentiments of K. Burdach in

regard to Luther's influence on the character and origin of the NHG. *schriftsprache* and on the dissemination of the same. From the many divergent opinions as to the relative value of the prints and Mss., before and after certain dates, H. sifts as indisputable the fact that the best sources from which to draw material for a correct representation of his language, as it was at the beginning of his literary work, are his autograph Mss. The text on which H.'s investigation is based is that found in Braune's *Ndr.* 93, 94, an essentially accurate reproduction of Luther's autograph Ms. of this sermon. After a comprehensive treatment of the phonology, morphology, and orthography of the same, H. sums up his general results as follows: 1. Luther's own language is different from that of his printed works, only his autograph Mss. present a true picture of it. 2. The language of this sermon shows marks of a transition stage. 3. Although the basis of this monument is essentially NHG., yet many archaic and dialectic forms are found in it.

#### MISCELLEN UND LITTERATUR

Pp. 109-110. Theodor Braune gives "*Oberrheinische sprichwörter und redensarten*," culled from a politico-ecclesiastical reform article found in a Colmar Ms., and belonging to the time from 1490 to 1510. — Pp. 110-117. John Meier shows that Nigrinus (*Wider die rechte Bacchanten*, 1559) is influenced more by Frank (*Laster der trunkenheit*, 1531) than by Friderich (*Wider den Sauffteuffel*, 1552), as is claimed by Hauffen. — Pp. 117-118. F. Kluge derives *eichen* from a Pregerm. \**ikôn* = Lat. *aequâre*. Albert Pick, p. 374, shows this etymology to have been suggested as early as 1873 by A. Scheler in his *Dict. d'Étymologie française*. — Pp. 118-121. Theodor Braune throws light on the so far obscure etymology of OHG. *narro*, MHG. *narre*, NHG. *narr*. It is not to be derived, with Diez, from MLat. *nario*, but rather is the source of it. The stem *nar*, *nir*, *nur*, as it appears in the various related words, has onomatopoetic origin. — P. 121. R. Sprenger identifies MHG. *zîteldse*, *zîtldse* with *colchicum speciosum*. — Pp. 124-126. G. Rosenhagen reviews rather unfavorably Zeidler's *Untersuchung des verhältnisses der handschriften von Rudolfs von Es 'Wilhelm von Orlens'* (Prag, 1894). The same reviewer accepts Priebisch's conclusions as to source and home of "*Diu Vrône botschaft ze der christenheit*" (Graz, 1895). — H. Jellinghaus, pp. 132-133, has words of praise for E. L. Fischer's *Grammatik und wortschatz der plattdeutschen mundart im preussischen Samlande*

(Halle, 1896).—Otto Mensing, reviewing Merkes' *Beiträge zur lehre vom gebrauch des infinitivus im neuhochdeutschen auf historischer grundlage* (Leipzig, 1896), pp. 134–137, regards many of the author's conclusions interesting and valuable, but desires them to be put in a more scientific form.—J. W. Bruinier, pp. 138–139, highly commends H. Wunderlich's *Unsere umgangssprache in der eigenart ihrer satzfügung dargestellt* (Weimar und Berlin, 1894).—Pp. 140–142. Finnur Jónsson speaks very favorably of Konráð Gíslason's *Forelæsninger over oldnordiske skjaldekvaed* (København, 1895), ed. by Dr. Björn Magnússon Ólsen, as the first volume of *Konráð Gíslason, Efterladte skrifter*.—Pp. 218–223. Max Schlickinger defends, against Keinz, his position in regard to the *Helmbrechtshof und seine Umgebung*.—Pp. 223–228. G. Sarrazin reviews, on the whole favorably, Wülfing's *Die syntax in den werken Alfreds des Grossen* (Bonn, 1894).—Pp. 228–235. O. Jiriczek has high words of commendation for the project of publishing the *Altnordische sagabibliothek*, herausgeg. von Gustaf Cederschiöld, Hugo Gering und Eugen Mogk (Halle, Niemeyer), in general, and for the first three numbers of the same: 1. *Ares Isländerbuch*, herausg. von Wolfgang Golther (1892); 2. *Orvar-Odds saga*, herausg. von R. C. Boer (1892); 3. *Egils-saga Skallagrímssonar*, herausg. von Finnur Jónsson (1894), in particular. The review is prefaced with very lucid remarks on the history and necessity of ON. studies. Of interest is also the footnote on pp. 230 f. in defence of 'literary' text criticism, the publication of normalized texts, while at the same time acknowledging the great value of 'diplomatically true reprints'.—Pp. 236–243. A. Jeitteles speaks well of Rud. Wolkan's *Geschichte der deutschen litteratur in Böhmen bis zum ausgange des XVI. jahrhunderts* (Prag, 1894).—Pp. 244–262. H. Düntzer has words of appreciation, but also of severe criticism, for *Goethe's werke* (Weim. Ausg.), I. Bd. 18. 25, 1; III. Bd. 7; IV. Bd. 17, 18.—Pp. 263–269. Charles Schmidt's *Wörterbuch der Strassburger mundart* contains, according to Heinrich Menges, "übergenug des anziehenden und lehrreichen," although many quite common expressions are omitted, others are incorrectly interpreted, and the etymological explanations are weak and open to objections.—Pp. 269–271. Gustav Binz condemns Bernh. Schmidt's *Der vokalismus der Siegerländer mundart* (Halle, 1894).—Friedrich Kauffmann, reviewing Bremer's critique of Wenker's *Sprachatlas*, and Wrede's *Über richtige interpretation der Sprachatlaskarten*, advises to remember Wenker's own words: "der Sprachatlas bringt nichts

als eine geographisch geordnete reproduction des in den formularen überlieferten schriftlichen tatbestandes." — Pp. 372–374. G. Bossert contributes *Lutherana*. — Pp. 374–384. M. H. Jellinek reviews Streitberg's *Urgerm. Grammatik*, on the whole favorably. His criticisms have reference especially to the meagre remarks on Germanic secondary accent, the treatment of  $\bar{e}^2$ , the rather indefinite terminology, the method of citation, etc., not to mention the refutation of Streitberg's objections to the reviewer's own theories. — Pp. 385–393. Max Rachel notices favorably three new contributions to the Hans Sachs literature. — Pp. 394–414. Theodor Siebs reviews at length Rudolf Kögel's *Geschichte der deutschen litteratur bis zum ausgange des mittelalters*. 1. band, 1. teil: *die stabreimende dichtung und die gotische prosa* (Strassburg, 1894). *Nebst ergänzungsheft: die altsächsische genesis* (*ibid.* 1895). He appreciates the author's interesting way of treating the important questions pertaining to the history of Germanic poetry, his ingenious contributions to the knowledge of Germanic antiquities and metrics, his many linguistic explanations, and especially his conscientious work upon the OS. and earlier OHG. monuments; but he also raises numerous objections, *e.g.* in regard to inferences drawn from the testimony of Tac., to K.'s cosmogonic ideas, his view of the Longobards and their relation to the Anglo-Frisian group, of alliteration in legal sources, of the home of the *Heliand* poet, etc. He repeatedly censures K.'s conclusions as being altogether unwarranted. — Pp. 414–417. Gustav Binz, reviewing Thomas Miller's *Place Names in the English Bede and the Localization of the Mss.*, considers the author's theory, if not proved, at any rate, not impossible. — Pp. 418–424. M. Spanier commends Wilhelm Uhl's edition of *Murner's Gäuchmatt* (Leipzig, 1896), but also offers numerous suggestions and corrections. Pp. 426–428. J. Schmedes has an appreciative review of Paul Cauer's *Grundfragen der Homerkritik* (Leipzig, 1895), and recommends a similar treatment of the *Nibelungenlied*. He likewise announces 1. *Studentensprache und studentenlied in Halle vor hundert jahren, eine Jubiläumsgabe für die universität H.-W. dargebracht vom Deutschen abend in Halle*; 2. *Hallische studentensprache* von John Meier; 3. *Deutsche studentensprache* von Friedrich Kluge, pp. 428–431. — K. Zacher, pp. 531–533, points out coincidences in Lucretius and Otfried which make it probable that Otfried was acquainted with Lucretius. Did he know the now lost Ms. of the fourth or fifth century, which in the ninth century was "in quadam regni Francici parte"? — Pp. 537–

542. Ludwig Fränkel has nothing but highest praise for F. M. Böhme's *Volkstümliche lieder der Deutschen im 18. und 19. jahrhundert* (Leipzig, 1895). Cp. with this John Meier's review of the same author's edition of *Erk's Deutscher liederhort*, pp. 557-559.— Pp. 543-544. Hugo Gering brings corrections and additions to his *Glossar zu den liedern der Edda* (Paderborn, 1896).— Pp. 548-550. Franz Ahlgrimm accepts only partly the results of Arth. Fückel's dissertation *Der Ernestus des Odo von Magdeburg und sein verhältnis zu den übrigen älteren bearbeitungen der sage vom herzog Ernst* (Marburg, 1895).— Pp. 552-557. Theodor Siebs criticises very severely the first section of the *Friesch woordenboek, bewerkt door Waling Dijkstra en dr. F. Buitenrust Hettema, benevens lijst van friesche eigennamen, bewerkt door Johan Winkler* (Leeuwarden, 1896).— G. Sarrazin, p. 564, identifies Woldietrich with the pretender Gundovald mentioned by Gregory, *Hist. Francorum*, lib. VII.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN.

ERNST H. MENSEL.

---

 CORRECTION.

In my notice of Lindelöf's *Glossar*, in the last number of this *Journal*, I said: 'The very common word *ilce* he has omitted altogether, without notice or correction.' In making this statement, I had overlooked the fact that his instances are given under *ðe ilca*. His reasons for so doing are not obvious, and he gives no cross-reference under *ilca*; I was thus misled into doing him an injustice which I sincerely regret.

ALBERT S. COOK.